

1.C1

20. (New) The method according to claim 8, wherein the step of producing the report includes:

processing the log file from the end backward until the beginning.

B20

21. (New) The computer-readable medium according to claim 13, wherein the step of producing the report includes:

processing the log file from the end backward until the beginning.

22. (New) The computer-readable medium according to claim 18, wherein the step of producing the report include:

processing the log file from the end backward until the beginning.

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-18 are pending, in which claims 19-22 are newly presented, and claims 1, 3-10, and 12-18 are amended. Care was exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter.

The Office Action mailed December 5, 2002 rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Arsenault* (US 5,408,650).

In response to 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph rejections, claims 1, 3-10, and 12-18 have been amended. In particular, the term “interesting” has been replaced by “marked.”

The rejection over *Arsenault* is respectfully traversed because the applied reference does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1-18. For example, independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, recite:

logging a plurality of stack traces and associated tags in a **log file** at respective point during execution of the program; and recording within the **log file** one or more of the tags as one or more **marked tags**.

In addition, claims 6 and 15, as amended, recite:

Accessing a **log file** comprising a list of stack traces and respective tags at respective points during execution of the program and comprising one or more ~~of the recorded as~~ one or more **marked tags**; and producing the diagnostic report based on the **log file**. X

Accordingly, claims 1-18, as amended, require “recording within the **log file** one or more of the tags as one or more **marked tags**.” This limitation is not found in *Arsenault* because *Arsenault* does not disclose “log file” or “marked tags.” In fact, neither a “log file” nor a “marked tag” is even mentioned in the portion of *Arsenault* cited in the Office Action.

Rather, *Arsenault* discloses a “graphic representation” (Col. 5: 65) consisting of “a map of allocated memory segments depicted by segment type” (Col. 6:1-2) and various “listings” (Col. 6:2) shown on a “display device” (Col. 5:68) to a user, not the “recording within the log file one or more of the tags as one or more marked tags” as presently recited in independent claims 1 and 10.

The dependant claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14, and 16-18 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their independent claims and are separately patentable on their own merits.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-425-8516 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

4.25.03

Date



Leila Abdi
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 52399

10507 Braddock Rd
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8501
Fax. 703-425-8518